

Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee

Meeting 2 Notes

April 28, 2004

Ellensburg

Members:

Bob Alberts	Tom Fox	Rachael Paschal	Frank Triplett
Karen Allston	David Fujimoto	Osborn	Judy Turpin
Randy Black	Richard Gustav	Jerry Peterson	Tim Wilson
(alternate for John Kirner)	Connie Krueger	Gary Rhoades (chair)	Donald Wright
Ben Bonkowski	Howard Laughery	Denise Smith	
Greg Brizendine	Bob Pancoast (chair)	Debbie Thomas	

Alternates:

Bruce Beauchene	Andrew Cook	Bev Keating	Mark Tompkins
Randy Black	Andrew Graham	Shirley Nixon	Betty Vance
Marla Carter	Jim Haneline	Harry Paul	
Lynn Coleman	David Johnson	Steve Skipworth	

DOH & Consultants

Jim Rioux	Deana Pavwoski	Laird Harris
Jennifer Kropack	Rich Siffert	Cynara Lilly

Others:

John Charba	Budd Grecco	Danford Moore	John Stuhlmiller
-------------	-------------	---------------	------------------

I. Introductions and Housekeeping

- A. General housekeeping announcements were made by Jim Rioux and Gary Rhoades
 - 1. It was noted that the meeting #1 minutes would be changed for the record to reflect the attendance of Harry Paul and Tom Clingman.
 - a. The agenda was reviewed and handouts were clarified.

II. Ground Rules

- A. The ground rules as discussed in the April 7, 2004 meeting were reviewed. No changes were suggested.
- B. Laird Harris noted that after the April 7, 2004, meeting, some members of the subcommittee expressed a desire to move more quickly through issue discussions and that side conversations had been a problem.

III. Approve Charter and Process Proposal

- A. The Charter and Process Proposal as revised following the April 7, 2004, meeting were reviewed and discussed by the subcommittee.
1. It was noted that the charter had been adjusted to permit a member to request that his/her alternate be allowed to present information during meetings if the alternate has important expertise. Permission would be granted by consent of the subcommittee.
 - a. ACTION: Repeated statement will be deleted in final revision.
 2. It was noted that the State Technical Panel section of the original charter had been removed in the new draft as decided by the group at the April 7, 2004, meeting.
 3. The roles of the chair and vice chair were discussed. It was noted that the revised draft of the charter set the primary responsibility of chair and vice chair as coordinating meetings and arranging the agenda that is approved by the subcommittee.
 4. The revised draft of the charter specified that scope of work and membership of the ad hoc work groups would be decided by the subcommittee. After discussion by the subcommittee, it was decided that the ad-hoc groups should be formed by DOH and the chairs. The subcommittee would reserve the right to express concerns about the ad hoc group if there was issue.
 - a. ACTION: Item 1 to be struck from ad hoc section of revised draft of charter
 - b. ACTION: Strike the words 'for approval' from ad hoc section of revised draft of the charter item 2
 5. It was noted that the revised charter language described the decision making process for subcommittee actions other than report approval as generally informal. When divisions within the subcommittee make informal approval impossible, the matter may be brought to a formal vote by the chair.
 6. As needed, the chair and Jim will ask an outside expert or an ad hoc group to present points of view and technical information relevant to subcommittee deliberations.
 7. It was noted that the charter could be modified as needed at any time during the subcommittee's process.
 - a. The question of not mentioning the state technical panel aspect in the charter was revisited by Denise Smith

- b. ACTION: Denise to give draft language if she feels it is necessary to alter charter to include provisions about a technical panel.
- 8. DOH stated that it was looking for a final report that includes all opinions but it would be greatly helped in its rule making by recommendations that had received wide support. There was considerable discussion about the language in the revised draft for the subcommittee's process for developing the final report that described how recommendations would be treated.
 - a. It was determined that the proposed method of circulating drafts and having members sign on was not the preferred method of the subcommittee.
 - i. ACTION: It was agreed that the paragraph beginning with 'In the event...' will be stricken.
 - b. It was understood that the subcommittee would not take formal votes on individual recommendations, but DOH would highlight areas of agreement in the report narrative. The subcommittee would review the narrative.

IV. Planning presentation

- A. Deana Pavwoski presented the method in which DOH helps water systems plan to ensure resources.

V. Definitions of Water Use Efficiency, Conservation and Curtailment

- A. Draft definitions for water use efficiency, conservation and curtailment were presented to the subcommittee.
 - 1. For the purposes of the subcommittee, water use efficiency and water conservation must be defined as written by legislature.
 - 2. It was agreed that the word mandatory be struck from the language about curtailment.
 - 3. Group requested a definition for water shortage response plan that specifically cites language in the law
 - a. ACTION: DOH to return to group with edited definitions.

VI. Public Comments

- A. No public comments were made at this time.

VII. Working Lunch

- A. Announcements on related activities
 - 1. Jim presented other projects involving conservation issues that are currently going on in Washington State and that could of interest to the subcommittee.
- B. An update of documents available and website capabilities for the group was given.
- C. Jim described the DOH vision for the subcommittee.

VIII. Game Plan for Completing Subcommittee Work

- A. Jim presented general thoughts from DOH on framing the subcommittee work. The goal is to have the work plan of the subcommittee follow the structure of the Municipal Water Law, beginning with CPR.
- B. Outline for meeting schedule was presented. It was noted that the schedule was flexible and additional dates and topics can be added. There was general agreement that Jim's method as proposed would suffice for addressing meeting topics. Several important methodologies for addressing issues were discussed by the subcommittee.
 - 1. A request was made for the outline to be expanded with DOH clarifying where they may see need for ad hoc groups, outside expertise, etc., in order for the subcommittee and any ad hoc groups to have adequate time for research and input.
 - 2. It was recommended that future working lunches be used to review the previous meetings accomplishments while ideas and issues are still fresh.
 - 3. Concern was expressed that the group may need education.
 - 4. It was requested that documents reviewed by the group also be on an overhead projector so that everyone would know which document was under discussion.

IX. Conservation Planning Requirements

- A. Jennifer Kropack walked the subcommittee through CPR and highlighted relevant sections.
- B. During discussion several key issues regarding CPR arose
 - 1. Question of applicability of section 5.3 arose.
 - a. ACTION: Jim to clarify section 5.3 at May 19, 2004 meeting.
 - 2. Generally, the importance of including small water systems in rulemaking, covering performance reporting requirements and thus related new technologies, clarification of DOH authority, data collection requirements and leakage as a separate entity from conservation were all highlighted and discussed.

X. Public Comments

- A. An unidentified audience member asked how leakage could be determined without meters and also stated for the group that it was the intent of small systems to bring evidence to the group that metering is not necessary.

XI. Meeting Wrap-Up/Next meeting Topics

- A. It was requested that all of the documents from the meeting be sent out via email. DOH assured group that in the future any documents that were not released in advance would not be considered at the meetings.
 - 1. ACTION: DOH will re-send via email all April 28, 2004 meeting documents.
- B. Topics for the May 19, 2004 meeting include general intent, planning statements, data elements and demand forecast.
- C. The group was asked whether or not they felt more CPR education was needed. There was no answer.